

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Amdt. dated 10/29/2004
Reply to Official Action of July 30, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application, as evidenced by the first Official Action. The first Official Action rejects Claims 1-11, 14-24 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,457,030 to Adams et al.; and rejects Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adams patent. The first Official Action also rejects Claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adams patent, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088 to Halahmi. In response to the Official Action, Applicants have added new Claims 30-32 to recite further patentable features of the claimed invention. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of the present application is patentably distinct from the Adams patent and the Halahmi patent, taken individually or in combination. Applicants therefore respectfully traverse the rejections of the claims. In view of the added claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

The Adams patent discloses a system for modifying web content for display via pervasive computing devices. As disclosed, HTML files are associated with content modification files specifying how those HTML files should be modified for display by pervasive computing devices. In this regard, the content modification file associated with an HTML file can be identified from a link to the content modification file within the HTML file. Alternatively, the content modification file associated with an HTML file can be identified by computing a hash value using content within the HTML file, the content modification file being associated with the computed hash value. In operation, then, the system receives a request for an HTML file from a pervasive computing device. The system identifies the content modification file associated with the requested HTML file, and modifies elements of the requested HTML file based upon the associated content modification file. The modified HTML file is then displayed by the pervasive computing device.

Independent Claim 1 of the present application recites a method that includes receiving a request for a digital document from a device over a communication channel. Portions of the text of an original version of the digital document are altered to produce a revised version of the

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Amdt. dated 10/29/2004
Reply to Official Action of July 30, 2004

digital document in which the text is shorter than the text of the original document. In this regard, portions of the text are altered based on preferences associated with the device. After altering portions of the text to produce the revised version of the digital document, the revised version is transmitted over the communication channel in response to the request.

In contrast to the method of independent Claim 1, the Adams patent does not teach or suggest altering portions of the text of an original version of a digital document based on preferences associated with the device. The Adams patent does disclose altering HTML files, which could correspond to digital documents, for display by pervasive devices. In accordance with the Adams system, however, the HTML files are altered based on a configuration file that is associated, not with the device as in independent Claim 1, but with the HTML file itself. Thus, in accordance with the Adams patent, an HTML file is altered based on a configuration file associated with the HTML file, and independent of an association with the pervasive device requesting the HTML file. In contrast, in accordance with the method of independent Claim 1, a digital document is altered based on preferences associated with the device requesting the digital document, and as further recited by new dependent Claim 30, independent of an association with the digital document.

Applicants note that the Adams patent does disclose modifying HTML files based on a user's preferences. As an example of such a feature, the Adams patent explains that if a user is blind, text elements of a requested HTML file can be transcoded into audio files. Even in this instance, however, the user's preferences are associated with the user and not the device receiving the digital document, as recited by independent Claim 1. In this regard, by associating the preferences with the user, the preferences can relate to capabilities of the device, as recited by new dependent Claim 31. Additionally, the preferences can be independent of abilities of the user of the device (e.g., ability to view modified or altered documents), as recited by new dependent Claim 32.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the method of independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 2-25 and 29, is patentably distinct from the system and method disclosed by the Adams patent. Applicants also respectfully submit that the methods of independent Claims 26-28 recite subject matter similar to that of independent Claim 1. In this regard, the method of

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Amdt. dated 10/29/2004
Reply to Official Action of July 30, 2004

independent Claim 26 recites maintaining a database of preferences associated with different client devices. The method of independent Claim 27 recites associating preferences with the client device. And the method of independent Claim 28 recites information associating types of devices with transformations to be made to full web pages requested by that type of device. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 26, 27 and 28 are patentably distinct from the Adams patent for at least the same reasons given above with respect to independent Claim 1. As such, Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-11, 14-24 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Adams patent, and the rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adams patent, is overcome.

The first Official Action also rejects dependent Claims 25 and 29 as being unpatentable over the Adams patent, in view of the Halahmi patent. As explained above, the Adams patent does not teach or suggest altering portions of the text of an original version of a digital document based on preferences associated with the device, as recited by independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 25 and 29. Likewise, Applicants respectfully submit that the Halahmi patent does not teach or suggest altering portions of the text of an original version of a digital document based on preferences associated with the device. The Halahmi patent discloses a system and method for displaying email messages on a low bandwidth device by converting the messages into a standard file format, and passing the converted messages to an email portion server that is specific for a particular type of wireless communication device. The email portion server then formats the converted message into a specific format for transmission to the respective type of wireless communication device. The Halahmi patent therefore discloses an email portion server that is configured to alter email messages based upon a particular type of device, instead of altering email messages based upon preferences associated with devices, as recited by the claimed invention.

As neither the Adams patent nor the Halahmi patent individually teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention, the combination of the Adams patent and the Halahmi patent also does not teach or suggest this feature. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 25 and 29 are patentably distinct from the Adams patent and the Halahmi patent, taken

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Amdt. dated 10/29/2004
Reply to Official Action of July 30, 2004

individually or in combination, for at least the same reasons given above with respect to independent Claim 1. And as such, Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adams patent, in view of the Halahmi patent, is overcome.

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Amdt. dated 11/01/2004
Reply to Official Action of July 30, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the new claims and the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in due course. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.


Respectfully submitted,


Guy R. Gosnell
Registration No. 34,610

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. (703) 872-9700 on the date shown below.


Sarah B. Simmons

11-01-04
Date